

to be strong and the Treasury should be prepared to meet it.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OFFICES OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT TO BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it was announced Tuesday that the transfer of the duties of certain offices of the Treasury Department to the larger cities will result in some reduction in personnel and reduce the cost of the Department by \$5 million annually. If it is true that this action will reduce the cost of operating the Revenue Bureau without any corresponding reduction in services it will meet our approval. However, I am not sure that this will be the result, and I am disappointed that the Department saw fit not to consult at least some members of the Finance Committee before releasing this announcement to the newspapers. It would have been much better had we been advised on what is planned. In the absence of any background information all I can do is look at the report.

First, I have been somewhat puzzled that so much of this transfer is being concentrated in Boston. It could be argued that removing offices from Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and transferring them to Boston was an attempt to centralize in the larger cities, but I do not understand how transferring the main offices out of New York to Boston can be justified on the same line of reasoning. Therefore that line of reasoning is invalid. There is a suspicion that political consideration may have been a factor in making these decisions.

The release says they are going to save \$5 million for the taxpayers. I would compliment them on that objective, but in the budget submitted by the administration they are asking for an additional \$430 million to run the Treasury Department next year. Furthermore, according to the 1964 budget they are planning to add 4,449 extra employees for the Treasury Department. If we must increase next year's appropriations by \$430 million and add an additional 4,100 employees to save this \$5 million my only comment is that on that basis we can soon save ourselves into bankruptcy.

I hope the Department can make a better justification for the transfer than that outlined in their press release. If they can show that this is a bona fide reduction in expenditures without handicapping the service I will support them notwithstanding the fact that it affects one of the offices in my State. I think this agency and all agencies should be operated as economically as possible. But I do not think we should boast of savings if it merely means transferring offices or jobs from one place to another. Such irresponsible transfers would be not only inconvenient to the employees involved but inconvenient to the American taxpayers as well.

While the Treasury Department has a responsibility to operate its Department as economically as possible, it also has a

responsibility to render proper service to the taxpayers, and taxpayers in Delaware and the other States are just as worthy of consideration as are the voters in Boston.

TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I commend President Kennedy for the statement he made at his press conference yesterday on the test ban negotiations. It contained a categorical assurance to the Senate and to the American people that this administration will not negotiate a test ban treaty which allows the possibility of undetected Soviet cheating.

I quote from the press conference transcript:

Question. Mr. President, on Monday Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said even if the Russians were able to test underground indefinitely this would not alter the strategic military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. He said this was the executive assessment. Given that assessment, can you tell us what considerations then would prevent accepting a test ban on the terms set by Russia.

Answer. I don't think, if I may say so—in my opinion that is not what is the administration's position. We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which would permit indefinite underground testing by the Soviet Union. We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. That is the administration's position. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it.

While the President was making this statement, Carl F. Romney, assistant technical director, Air Force Technical Application Center, in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy pointed out that it is possible for the Soviets to make significant underground tests without any possibility of seismic detection by us.

I quote from the Washington Post:

Replying to questions, Romney said that a potential cheater would be able to test 1-kiloton devices in granite; 2- to 6-kiloton devices in tuff (a volcanic ash); and 10- to 20-kiloton devices in dry alluvium (a sandy material), with no seismic means presently available to catch the cheater.

In previous testimony before the Committee it was noted that the majority of U.S. underground nuclear tests being conducted in Nevada involved devices of 4 kilotons or less, indicating that atomic weapons progress can be made using devices of these sizes.

Mr. President, I believe it is clear from this that the contentions expressed by Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in a recent statement of official policy, have been repudiated by the President in two highly significant ways.

Mr. Fisher said we were willing to accept a treaty that contained a possible risk that a series of underground tests could go undetected, and that we could accept this risk because the progress the Russians could make through secret tests would not be significant enough to alter the balance of power.

I was greatly heartened by the President's statement that this was not his

policy, that he would never accept a treaty that did not contain every assurance that the Soviets could not conduct a series of secret tests.

I support the view expressed by the President, and I assume that the Disarmament Agency and the negotiators at Geneva will conform to the President's view and make whatever alterations are necessary in Mr. Fisher's statement of policy.

During the past several days the real issues involved in the test-ban treaty have been brought to the American people more closely than ever before.

I am happy to have had the opportunity to play a small role in accelerating this debate and bringing these issues before the people.

I believe that Mr. Adrian Fisher should be congratulated for candidly and clearly presenting a statement of policy that is supported by many test-ban advocates but that differs significantly from the policy laid down yesterday by the President. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has performed an invaluable service by conducting excellent hearings which have pointed out clearly the dangers inherent in our present test-ban proposal. The Washington Post also deserves commendation for using so much of its editorial and news space to present both sides of this issue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the following items which trace the development of this debate:

A copy of the Washington Post story describing my February 21 speech on the floor of the Senate concerning the nuclear test ban negotiations.

A February 22 Washington Post editorial critical of my speech.

My March 1 reply to the Washington Post editorial.

The March 4 reply to my letter by Mr. Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

A March 5 Washington Post editorial supporting Mr. Fisher's position.

My March 5 reply to Mr. Fisher in the form of a letter to the Washington Post.

The March 7 Washington Post news story concerning President Kennedy's news conference and testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

An extract from the President's news conference as printed in the Washington Post of March 7.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]
U.S. CONCESSIONS ON A-TEST BAN COURT WAR, DODD WARNS SENATE

(By Julius Duscha)

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, charged yesterday that the Kennedy administration is courting war by granting concessions to the Soviet Union in nuclear test-ban negotiations.

In a lengthy Senate speech, Dodd, a conservative Democrat frequently at odds with American foreign policy, said that both the Kennedy and Eisenhower administrations have made concession after concession to the Russians.

Dodd said that so many concessions have been made that he would vote against a